6. Can we know when to trust our emotions in the pursuit of knowledge? Consider history and one other area of knowledge.  
  
- traumatic experiences can change our outlook  
- talk about bias -->can be good (provide inside on how people of a certain group felt) and bad ( not objective)  
- go into Ethics: emotions --> very powerful in determining our morals - often our emotions are based on past experiences with the subject so they are not random  
- talk about how emotions can be an obstacle to knowledge ie. how it can scew our perception of things ( also could talk how emotive language can bias you and cheat you into agreeing with someone making illogical claims.  
- emotions enable us to make rational decisions

Emotions become more and more trustworthy, the more experience we have. Eg. Dad is quite confident in the way he judges a situation or how he interprets behavior in other people.

Can we trust emotions? Can we NOT trust them?

Very brief outline:

1. How do we trust our emotions?
2. Can we trust emotions? Can we NOT trust them?
3. When are our emotions trustworthy and when aren’t they
4. How can we know, if ever, when to trust our emotions?

To do:

* Find examples in History where emotions were useful
  + When my Mom almost ran over a little boy with her car? Intuitively stopped.
  + Relationships: my Mom can often tell just by looking at me whether I’m well or not
* Find examples in History where emotions weren’t useful
  + A situation where someone was pulled apart emotionally and ended up doing nothing...
  + Propaganda 🡪 Hitler and Mao Zedong and (Castro) heavily used propaganda to influence people to follow them 🡪 their support resulted in WWII ...BUT it was useful to Hitler and Mao and (Castro) 🡪 you could go into moral relativism (can you ever holistically judge something to be right or wrong / beneficial or not beneficial? )
* Find examples in Ethics
  + Someone being pulled apart by duties 🡪 LOTR (Beregond going against his master but saving Faramir’s life in the process) 🡪 useful, benefitial (saved a life) ... maybe could argue both sides with the same example 🡪 not useful (killed some others in the process 🡪 others didn’t agree with him causing conflict.
  + Tie in Kant 🡪 consistency? Guards were consistent in obeying Denethor’s orders; but Beregond’s treason saved life 🡪 who’s right?
* Include some theories/principles of Ethics and History